

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 10-14, 16-21, 23, 24, 26-31, and 33-40 are currently pending. Claims 1, 14, 23, 24, 26, and 27 have been amended. New matter has not been added with the amendments to the claim. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in accordance with the following remarks.

Allowable Claims

Claims 33-35 were indicated as allowable. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter.

Section 102 Rejections

Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 10-14, 16-21, 23, 24, 26-31, and 36-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,523,026 to Gilles ("Gilles"). Applicant respectfully disagrees that the claims are unpatentable over the Gillis reference.

Claim 1 recites:

defining a semantic vector for each document based on the linguistic analysis, said semantic vector having multiple components, wherein each component of said semantic vector has at least:

- a term included in the document or a synonym of said term;
- a weighting factor relating to an importance, based on characteristics of the document, of said term; and
- a frequency value relating to a number of occurrences of said term.

The Office Action states that Gillis teaches this feature at column 10, lines 19-22, and column 42, line 67-column 43, line 1, by teaching that a small subset of terms is chosen from the source domain and may be weighted to reflect their importance to the user. However, Gillis fails to teach a component of a semantic vector that includes a weighting factor relating to an importance, based on characteristics of the document, of said term. Instead, Gillis teaches that terms may be weighted to reflect their importance to a user (Gillis, column 42, line 67-column

43, line 1). Accordingly, since Gillis fails to teach each and every feature of the claim, claim 1 and its corresponding dependent claims are allowable over the cited art.

Independent claims 14, 23, 24, 26, and 27 recite limitations similar to claim 1.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons mentioned in connection with claim 1, claims 14, 23, 24, 26, and 27 and their corresponding dependent claims are allowable over the cited art.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

In view of the above, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully submits that the Application is in condition for allowance, and requests such a Notice. If the present Application is not allowed and/or if one or more of the rejections is maintained or made final, Applicant hereby requests a telephone conference with the Examiner and further requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to schedule a telephone conference.

A Request for Continued Examination and a fee authorization for the required fee are being submitted with this reply. If any extension of time is required, Applicant hereby requests the appropriate extension of time. Please apply any additional fees or credits due to Deposit Account No. 05-0765.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 20, 2008

/Elizabeth Philip Dahm/
Elizabeth Philip Dahm
Reg. No. 51,352

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1717 Main Street, Suite 5000
Dallas, TX 75201
Telephone: (214) 760-6119
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945